

**CMER Meeting
August 27, 2001
Fireside Room, United Churches, Olympia**

Name	Affiliation	E-mail
Dawn Pucci	Suquamish Tribe	dpucci@suquamish.nsn.us
Craig Hansen	US FWS	craig_a_Hansen@fws.gov
Mary Raines	NWIFC	mraines144@aol.com
Mark Hersh	US EPA	hersh.mark@epa.gov
Jeffrey Clark	Weyerhaeuser	jeffrey.clark@weyerhaeuser.com
Bruce Lippke	UW	blippke@u.washington.edu
Mark Hunter	WDFW	huntemah@dfw.wa.gov
Mike Liquori	Campbell Group	mliquori@campbellgroup.com
Dave Price	WDFW	pricedmp@dfw.wa.gov
Timothy Quinn	WDFW	quinntq@dfw.wa.gov
Jeff Grizzel	DNR	jeff.grizzel@wadnr.gov
Darin Cramer	WDNR	darin.cramer@wadnr.gov
Terry Jackson	WDFW	jackstbj@dfw.wa.gov
Joseph Pavel	NWIFC	jpavel@nwifc.wa.gov
LN 'Pete' Peterson	UCUT	lpetz@aimcomm.com
Bill Ehinger	DOE	wehi4bl@ecy.wa.gov
Domini Glass	GECI	dglass@centurytel.net
Geoff McNaughton	DNR	Geoffrey.McNaughton@wadnr.gov
Dave Parks	DNR	dave.parks@wadnr.gov
Brian Francsen	Weyerhaeuser	brian.francsen@weyerhaeuser.com
Doug Martin	WFPA	martin1696@aol.com
Deborah Lindley	DNR	Deborah.lindley@wadnr.gov
Blake Rowe	Longview Fibre	bsrowe@longfibre.com
Jim MacCracken	Longview Fibre	jmac@aone.com

Adaptive Management Administrator

Geoff McNaughton was introduced and welcomed to the group. Geoff's e-mail is geoffrey.mccnaughton@wadnr.gov. Jeff Grizzel will help Geoff with the transition.

Last Meeting's Minutes

T.Quinn proposed changing wording on Page 2, under Project Prioritization in the third paragraph from "Quinn, Martin and Grizzel provided direction to the committee to consider the 13 projects already funded..." to "CMER will consider the 13 projects already funded...". There was a motion and a second to accept these changes.

Discussion on the motion and the content of the paragraph:

- SAGs will have to do bulk of review, then make a recommendation on peer review requirements to CMER. CMER will take the review from there. SAGs are encouraged to use the Scientific Review Team to assist them as needed in project development.

- The previously approved 13 projects have an established priority. They will not go back “into the pot” for today’s round of prioritization. However, this does not mean they have passed review.
- The RMZ resampling project will go through peer review after RFP.

Motion passed.

Workplan

The CMER workplan is due December 2001. The workplan will detail the methods and procedures of the CMER process (e.g. who will operate, who is engaged, what does it take to move a project forward, etc). The document will clearly lay out responsibilities of participants in the CMER process. Geoff will lead the workgroup writing the methods/procedures part of plan and is looking for volunteers. Perhaps rewriting the ‘purple document’ will be sufficient. Volunteers: Jeff Grizzel, Joseph Pavel, Domini Glass. Possible volunteers that will be contacted: Pete Heide, Allen Pleus, Helen Bressler and Blake Rowe. To meet deadline, a draft will have to be produced by mid October. The intended audiences include CMER, SAGs, politicians and legislators (as an example). Possible structure: 1st part is Methods and Procedures. 2nd part contains SAG workplans and budgets. 3rd part contains CMER’s workplan. Perhaps leave last two parts as appendices to maintain annual flexibility for document.

Budget

Newest version was passed out and is dated 8/14/01. Contains the budget of the round 1 prioritized projects (excluding the groundwater conceptual model and Bull Trout overlay and radiotelemetry projects). The significant change in the budget is the amount under the GF-S¹ is now \$455K rather than the \$600K it used to be. This is due to the 24% DNR takes for ‘administrative costs’. This is a new procedure (to us anyway). CMER gets nothing in return from DNR for this money. It was recommended that this issue be taken to the CMER oversight committee/ policy. Potential impacts of this include having to shift money around as there would not be enough money in the general state fund to cover projects (such as the LWAG resample project). Currently, the left over money is growing year to year – we are getting more money than we are spending. We should consider this and possibly reappropriate funds and projects so that we do not protest to DNR about the loss of \$145 K (the 24%) while having a growing surplus amount.

Scientific Reviewers

FPB endorsed UW/WSU as the preferred reviewers at the August 8, 2001 FPB meeting. However, a few days after the board meeting, UW called Geoff stating that they cannot route funds through Forest Resources, which would have deferred 50% of the costs. The proposal submitted by UW/WSU assumed these costs could be deferred. Now the cost for the Scientific Review Team, according to UW/WSU, is \$90-95K. Geoff, Jeff G, Tim Q, and Doug M met and decided to write a letter to UW/WSU stating that the contract agreed to and approved was for \$59K and it is expected that they find some way to honor that. The letter will be sent after final approval by the co-chairs. CMER may need to tighten up review procedures so that the 60-day deadline on proposals can be honored. We are actually outside this 60-day window for the UW/WSU proposal now.

SAG Updates and Technical Review Recommendations

UPSAG- Westside version of geo/topo/slope model is waiting for SRC review, otherwise, it is ready to go.

SAGE- recommends do not need review for their literature search. The RFP will be submitted to CMER for review.

BTSAG- Solar Radiation/temp. model study design will probably need to be reviewed once its design is finalized.

Monitoring Design Team Draft- ISP will want to look at final proposal. But it will probably get a SRC review too.

Relationships Chart

Doug M. has developed a relationship chart on SAG, CMER and AMPA relationships. The chart was distributed at the meeting. Contact Doug to get a copy.

Prioritization

SAGs were directed to bring projects that could be implemented by June 2002. This means that the project design needs to be completed by January 2002 to have the time to get it through review. Geoff put together a summary list of all projects submitted by SAGs for proposal along with study duration and their ranking using the 3 criteria. It is not known at this point if we have more money than projects. The prioritization process will take place anyway. Each SAG was given 3 minutes per project to introduce it.

WSAG :

- Forested wetland workshop
- Forested regeneration study

SAGE:

- No new projects

UPSAG:

- Update road surface erosion model
- Regional unstable landforms
- Site scale performance measures for roads, with a pilot study
- Site and sub-basin scale monitoring protocols
- Develop a state-wide landslide hazard class system and mapping protocols
 - DNR is getting money to do a zonation project. UPSAG will track this down and present at next meeting. Will prioritize project at this time.
- ID and develop measurable mass wasting metrics and monitoring protocols
- Test replicability of CMZ identification and delineation
- Lit search and synthesis on headwater streams.
- Refine demarcation between Np and Ns streams and SRC review for eastside slope stability were removed from the list as they have already been approved and hence prioritized.

Motion to lump the 3 road projects into one 'roads program' and 3 mass wasting projects into one 'mass wasting program'. Seconded. Passed. UPSAG had 4 final projects in the prioritization process

- Roads program
- Mass wasting program

- CMZ delineation
- Literature search

ISAG

- Fish Passage workshop, lit review and study design- 1st phase only (implementation is phase 2 and will have to go through prioritization again).
- Fish habitat model already funded so it was removed from list.

Clarification: Once a project is approved, it is approved for the budget proposed. If new components to that project arise, then the SAG asks CMER for additional funding. The project does not have to go through prioritization again.

RSAG

- Densiometer protocol
- Riparian growth and yield

Discussion:

- Will or can the budget for this project be used as seed money to establish the riparian growth and yield co-op? The question about holding a workshop to focus research agenda and discuss the riparian growth and yield data tables was asked.
- T.Quinn suggested getting a white paper/ literature review produced identifying key questions and identifying information gaps with regards to riparian growth and yields. This is a big and expensive issue that could use some more background information before approval of an expensive research project and paper. ISAG changed the project description so that is now a project to develop a white paper and maybe a workshop with a \$50K budget.

- Hardwood conversion

Discussion:

- Policy has decided this project will happen and funding will come from CMER. This project will be moved to top of priority list automatically.

LWAG

- Tailed frog meta-analysis
- Eastside snag retention
- Ponderosa pine birds
- Timber harvest and w. gray squirrel
- Univ KY bats
- Dunn's and Van Dyke's salamanders
- VanDyke's salamander lit. review
- Forest bats lit.review is being completed by OSU so project was taken off list
- Hairy woodpecker lost support within SAG so project was taken off list

Discussion:

- Squirrels, bats and birds have very little to do with FFR. However, if FPB is going to deal with scientific issues regarding these, they have to come from CMER. Funds for non-FFR projects have to come from State general funds.

- Motion was made to keep non-FFR projects in the process and rank with other projects then deal with their funding when we get to their point on the list. Seconded. Passed.

BTSAG

Discussion:

- If their projects are funded by an external source (FWS), then why do we prioritize them? If they require additional funding that would come from CMER, then they require prioritization. Terry J. believes that all BTSAG projects at this time are self-sufficient and do not require CMER money.
- Motion was made to not rank BTSAG projects with main list. Rank BTSAG projects on their own to assist BTSAG if they wish. Retracted.
- Motion was made to defer BTSAG project prioritization to some other time. Seconded. Passed.

Budget note: The sum of today's proposed project budgets is less than the \$792K budget surplus. However, \$160K out of the surplus has been earmarked for MDT and operating costs. But it does relieve the prioritizing pressure somewhat.

How to Vote:

Proposals~

1. Like last time
2. Everyone gets 5 equal votes
3. Fund all literature searches automatically and prioritize rest of remaining projects.

Decision~

Prioritize like last time; everyone has 5 ranked, weighted choices. Final list is reviewed afterwards. We will keep track of number of counts (regardless of ranks) to compare as an experiment. Submit ranked decisions to Tim for permanent record.

Priority Results

Hardwood Conversion (policy decision, not voted upon)

1. Fish passage (tie)
2. Roads (tie)
3. Mass wasting
4. Riparian growth and yield
5. Headwater lit
6. Forested wetland workshop
7. Tailed frogs
8. CMZ representation
9. Densiometer
10. Pond. Pine birds
11. Forested wetland regeneration
12. Dunn's and VanDyke's salamander habitat
13. Eastside Snag retention
14. [VanDyke's lit. review]*

15. W. Gray squirrel
16. KY bats (no votes)

*LWAG withdrew the VanDyke's lit review from the prioritization list (as per J. MacCracken)

Next Meeting

Discussion of ranking results. Consider:

- Cut off at some point
- Weighted versus tallied counts
- Projects coming up that will be bumped by the projects on the first 2 lists just because the coming projects are not able to be implemented by this June.
- Concerns that, because people vote in their expertise, wildlife votes fall to the bottom every time.
- Projects that have been brought up at this point should be the priority. If anything comes up after and is extremely important and has funding, send it to policy for a decision and consider it then.

Budgets:

- SAGS to bring list of projects that haven't been prioritized but are important and expensive.
- Reassessment by each SAG of budget allocations for all prioritized projects from both lists.
- Each SAG is encouraged to get an idea of future projects (costs and timelines) that are important but not brought forward at this time because they wouldn't be ready to go by June 2002.

Send to Geoff by Sept 14th.

Reminder: SAG workplans due in December

Next Meeting: Sept 19, Oct 17, Nov 14, Dec 12. Location to be announced.